

REMARKS

In the Official Action of March 2, 2007, it is noted that applicant's prior arguments with respect to claims 1-7, 11-28, 30 and 32-35 are now considered to be moot in view of a new ground of rejection. Specifically, the new ground of rejection is that claims 1-3, 7, 11, 13, 14, 17, 22-24 and 30 are rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as unpatentable over previously cited Orfali (and specifically the incorporated CORBA specifications with the relevant document entitled CORBA Services: Common Objects Services Specification, hereinafter CORBA_1), in view of US patent 6,910,074, Amin, et al (hereinafter Amin).

It is asserted that CORBA_1 discloses all of the limitations of claim 1 but fails to teach the action of establishing all interfaces required for providing a service connection based on information communicated by means of said protocol so as to establish interfaces between the interface entity and the external service provider without any beforehand defined interfaces for the service provisioning. It is then asserted that Amin teaches an analogous system and method for service session management in an IP centric distributed network and specifically discloses establishing all interfaces required for providing a service connection based on information communicated by means of said protocol so as to establish interfaces between the interface entity and the external service provider without any beforehand defined interfaces for the service provisioning.

It is respectfully submitted that Amin does not disclose this feature recited in claim 1. Amin discloses a system and method for service session management in an IP centric network. As seen in Figure 7 thereof, service is invoked through an allied application server (702) on the network to establish an amount of network resources requested by a user. The allied application server manages any changes requested by the user to the quality of service parameters and bandwidth amounts through the core network.

In particular, the cited passage relied upon by the Office (column 8, lines 29-40) discloses that provisioning of appropriate network infrastructure resources and air resources for desired bandwidth, data rate and selection of suitable data path is based on the default parameters during access session establishment (see Amin, column 8, lines

38-40). Therefore, the interfaces when establishing a service session are created in accordance with predetermined parameters.

Furthermore, it appears that the Office's argument also relies upon the passage in Amin at column 9, lines 24-28. Specifically, this passage discloses that the service session management task interfaces with the connection manager entity at the access network in order to alter the default setting or to establish a new setting for the transport session. However, this passage does not mention establishing interfaces between an interface entity and an external service provider.

While it is noted that Amin does mention an external service provider at column 13, lines 15-18; that is, service application server (712), there is no mention in Amin that interfaces are established between the external service provider and an interface entity without any beforehand defined interfaces. In fact, Figure 7 makes clear that the only interfaces between the third party service application server (712) are interfaces 2 and 3. Furthermore, it is only interface 3 which provides an interface between the interface entity (for example the allied service application server 702) and the third party service application server (712). Amin is silent with respect to establishing interface 3 without any beforehand defined interfaces for the service provisioning.

It is noted that the Office by relying upon column 8, line 61 through column 9, line 7, as well as column 13, lines 48-62 of Amin, may believe that Amin refers to a feature equivalent to establishing interfaces required for providing a service connection based on information communicated by means of said protocol so as to establish interfaces between the interface entity and the external service provider without any beforehand defined interfaces for the service provisioning, as required by claim 1. However, examination of Amin shows that the passage at column 14, lines 7-12, discloses no such feature. In fact, Amin only discloses that the third party vendor services require the ability to dynamically change the access resources within the any access network xAN 708 (e.g., a radio access network - RAN). As seen in Figure 7, the RAN is connected between the mobile host (700) and the core network. The RAN is in no way connected to

the third party service application server and therefore this passage does not relate to establishing interfaces between an interface entity and an external service provider.

In fact, Amin requires the interfaces to be established before any such request can be made by the third party vendor servers to change the access resources within the RAN. Amin is silent as to providing interfaces between the interface entity and the external service provider which are established without any beforehand defined interfaces for the service provisioning.

Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that Amin or a combination thereof with CORBA_1 simply does not disclose all of the features required by claim 1. In fact, Amin does not even suggest at providing the advantages of the present invention. For example, there is no mention of advantageously using a service provisioning session initiating in place of a transport protocol, such as CORBA_1. The present invention overcomes the inflexibility of CORBA_1 interfaces (see page 5, line 21 through page 6, line 4 of the present application) by providing a data network which is able to select and establish interfaces with the external services from those which are broadcast to it. This also advantageously allows external service providers to advertise their service capabilities to potential clients (see e.g., page 6, lines 8-29 of the present application).

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that claim 1 is not obvious under 35 USC §103(a) in view of CORBA_1, further in view of Amin.

For similar reasons, independent service interface arrangement claim 27 and independent data communication system claim 35 are believed to be not obvious in view of CORBA_1 further in view of Amin since these claims incorporate features similar to claim 1.


Since each of the independent claims of the present application are believed to be distinguished over the cited art, it is respectfully submitted that all of the dependent claims thereto are further distinguished over the cited art.

Please further note that applicant's arguments distinguishing the presently claimed invention over CORBA_1 as set forth in applicant's Pre-Appeal Brief Request for Review, are still believed to be applicable to the presently claimed invention.

In view of the foregoing, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance and reconsideration of the claim rejections is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 2, 2007



Alfred A. Fressola
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 27,550

WARE, FRESSOLA, VAN DER SLUYS
& ADOLPHSON LLP
Bradford Green, Building Five
755 Main Street, P.O. Box 224
Monroe, CT 06468
Telephone: (203) 261-1234
Facsimile: (203) 261-5676
USPTO Customer No. 004955